

Department of Political Science

Merit Evaluation and Annual Review Guidelines

Every year the department's Personnel Committee reviews the research, teaching and service of tenured or tenure track faculty members in political science. The purpose of the review is two-fold. One is to devise merit ratings for each member of the faculty member based on their contributions in the calendar year. These ratings are used by the department chair to set salaries for the coming year, subject to College and university guidelines. A second purpose of the review is to apprise faculty members of their progress toward important milestones: reappointment after the initial three years of service, tenure and promotion to associate rank, and promotion to full rank. The Personnel Committee also advises the chair on various awards and honors for political science faculty.

In its evaluation the Personnel Committee employs rubrics developed in consultation with the faculty and approved by their vote. The rubrics are described in the enclosure entitled Annual Merit Evaluation Procedures. The Personnel Committee applied these rubrics to materials submitted for review by the faculty in political science; if materials were absent or inadequate, the committee assigned a lower score, as the rubrics require.

In addition to issuing merit ratings the Personnel Committee also conducts an annual review of progress; an assessment of research, teaching and service. For each area of performance the committee briefly summarizes activity this year, placing it the context of accomplishments in rank (i.e. over two or more years of research, teaching, and service). The Personnel Committee also rates the cumulative record in rank using the standards employed for promotion and tenure. These ratings provide a rough sense of where you stand in relation to promotion, in the estimation of this year's Personnel Committee. This estimate is NOT binding on subsequent committees, and should be interpreted cautiously.

The Personnel Committee performs an annual review of all assistant and associate professors. It shares these reviews with the chair of political science, who meets with any faculty member who wishes to discuss his or her annual review. The Personnel Committee urges all assistant and associate professors to do so, as the chair observes the committee in action and can explain its reasoning in specific cases.

Initial faculty appointments in political science are probationary, and must be reviewed in a person's third year of service. This is university policy, and the Enhanced Annual Review Procedures describes its application in political science.

Annual Merit Evaluation Procedures

Annual merit evaluations of faculty members will be conducted in the following way:

1. For all faculty members, the relative weight of research, teaching, and service are allocated as follows: research (55 percent), teaching (35 percent), service (10) percent.
2. The following scales to evaluate faculty members on research, teaching, and service should be used:
 - a) Evaluation of research:

The PC reviews all the material each faculty member provides. Merit rankings for research are based on publications appearing in the calendar year only, although some credit is also given for completion or acceptance of books and edited volumes. The following guidelines (always subject to some fine tuning) are used to assign ratings for research:

0.5-1.0	No publications; little or no research activity
1.5-2.0	No publications but some genuine activity discernible
2.0-3.0	One chapter in edited book, one article in minor refereed journal, edited book accepted
3.5-4.0	Two chapters in edited book, two articles in minor refereed journals, or book submission
4.0-5.0	One major refereed article, major research grant, multiple chapter or journal publications, or edited book published
5.0-7.0	One leading refereed article (e.g., APSR), major book acceptance or publication, combination of multiple major publications

In addition:

- i. There is no special weighting scheme that accounts for the number of authors of research publications.
- ii. Foreign language publications count as long as they constitute major or minor publications as defined on the research scale. This has to be documented by the faculty member.
- iii. Translations will as a general rule not be treated as research, unless it can be demonstrated that they constitute original research. In this case, the burden of proof is on the faculty member to document the extent of original research involved in a translation.

b) Evaluation of Teaching:

Effective teaching is the reference point for this rubric. There is no single definition of what constitutes effective teaching, but some elements are common to all definitions. Effective teaching presents sound information, in a rigorous

fashion, from different points of view, in ways that are accessible to students with different learning skills, with appropriate assessments of students' comprehension of the material. In addition to the presentation of information and appropriate assessment, faculty who are judged effective in teaching are expected to hold regular office hours, prepare and distribute syllabi, meet regularly scheduled classes, and fulfill the expectations laid out in the IU Academic Handbook.

Evidence of effective teaching is drawn from a variety of sources: student evaluations of courses taught during the calendar year, syllabi, teaching grants and awards, service on undergraduate and graduate student committees, mentorship and direct supervision of honors, independent readings courses, internships and so on at the undergraduate level, and supervision of graduate student research captured in part by chairing progress review committees, organizing and conducting preliminary examinations, supervising doctoral dissertations and collaborating with graduate students, or teaching service-oriented courses. Teaching-related publications are also considered, with heaviest weight given to articles in refereed journals and books published by leading presses or in prestigious series or lines.

The committee makes allowances for a number of circumstances in applying the scale to individual faculty members (e.g., relatively new faculty members are unlikely to serve on a large number of graduate committees, etc.):

Teaching is evaluated on a scale from 0 to 7. A score of 4.0 is awarded to a faculty member who is an effective classroom teacher, supervises some independent learning by some undergraduates, and supervises the professional development of some graduate students. No teaching-related publications are necessary for this score, and the committee is sensitive to the fact that opportunities for supervising students are not equally available.

The committee begins the evaluation process by assigning a score of 4.0, and then adjusts this score for performance on different dimensions of teaching. It subtracts up to one point for each of the following: marginal or uneven classroom teaching; little or no supervision of independent learning by undergraduates; little or no supervision of graduate students' professional development.

The committee adds up to one point for each of the following: strong or outstanding classroom teaching; extensive or unusually effective supervision of independent learning by undergraduate students; extensive or unusually effective supervision of the professional development of graduate students; teaching-related publications in peer reviewed outlets.

The net result of these additions and subtracts is used to adjustment the presumptive score of 4.0.

In making adjustments, the committee assumes that strong or outstanding classroom teaching might include course development and pedagogical innovation, but curriculum development of a programmatic nature is more appropriately evaluated as service. Also, textbooks may be credited at the time of submission, as well as in the year of publication. As is the case for research, a third credit may be issued for textbooks that are subsequently honored. First editions will ordinarily weigh more than later editions, unless the revisions are very substantial.

Normal teaching load is two classes per semester, plus some supervision of undergraduate and graduate research activities commensurate with a faculty member's seniority. If a faculty member teaches no class during a semester, or 1 class, the faculty member's previous 3 year average for teaching will be used to substitute evaluations for classes (or a class) when merit evaluation for the teaching rubric are determined.¹

c) Evaluation of Service:

The PC will undertake a merit evaluation of every department member's service contribution. Appropriate service can take a variety of forms, but typically will include contributions to the effective operation of the department as well as contributions to the college, university, and profession as a whole. Department service might include conscientious membership and participation in department committees, as well as involvement in other forms of faculty self-governance (e.g., participation in faculty meetings, job talks, etc.), writing letters of recommendation, etc.) At the college or university level, examples might include participation in college or university-level committees or in other units of the university, or active involvement in intellectual and professional events (e.g., organizing a conference, or giving a talk for another department) outside our department. At the level of the profession, examples of appropriate service would include reviewing manuscripts and grant proposals, tenure and/or promotion reviews at other universities, participation in APSA or other professional organizations, journal editorships, the publication of book reviews, etc. Tenured and senior faculty *are typically expected to carry* heavier service loads than untenured faculty.

Service Evaluation Scale

Accumulation of service across different (e.g., department, college, university, professional) levels is typically the basis for differentiating scores. However, significant contributions to one type of service might be considered equivalent to limited service at two or more levels.

0 =no service

1-3 =limited or relatively minor service

¹ In case of newly appointed faculty members, the available evaluations—if any—will be averaged.

4 = effective service: typically a mixture of the activities described above at *any* level (department, college, university, profession)

5-6 = more than effective service also typically made up of a mixture of activities at different levels

7 =exemplary service at the department, college, university, and professional levels (for example, a heavy committee load in the department, perhaps membership in a major college or university committee (s), and a significant variety of professional obligations)

Enhanced Annual Review Procedures

Faculty members in their third-year should provide the Personnel Committee (PC) with a short (no more than 3pp.) *enhanced review including a* statement about how their research agenda is developing. It should include what they have accomplished already, as well as their plans for the next two years, an appraisal of teaching and service, and overall plans for the next few years (see addendum for relevant university policies).

Faculty members in their third-year should provide the Personnel Committee (PC) with a short (no more than 3pp.) *enhanced review including a* statement about how their research agenda is developing. It should include what they have accomplished already, as well as their plans for the next two years, an appraisal of teaching and service, and overall plans for the next few years (see addendum for relevant university policies).

University Policy on Enhanced Pre-Tenure Review (1991; Revised 2006)

The Policy Committee recommends that, for untenured faculty members, all departments of the College institute reviews in the third or fourth year of the probationary period more substantive than the annual review. The goal of this enhanced review is to provide faculty members with detailed, timely departmental assessments of their progress toward fulfilling tenure requirements. The review should include evaluations of records in the areas of teaching, research, and service. Evaluators should include at least two departmental members, in addition to the Chair. Results of the reviews will be shared with the candidates. It is understood that many departments already have in force viable systems of review that with little or no modification would fulfill the goals of this policy. The Dean shall have the responsibility for approving and monitoring enhanced review procedures. Annual reviews taking place in the third or fourth year of the probationary period leading to non-reappointment decisions must follow the Bloomington Faculty Council policy "Review of Non-Reappointment after the Initial Three Probationary Years" (March 4, 2003):

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/policies/Nonreapp.htm>. From the College website, under POLICIES.